



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/481,758	01/11/2000	Ahmed Tewfik	1064.002US1	6069

21186 7590 04/23/2004

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/481,758

Applicant(s)

TEWFIK ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date g.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A filed 2/6/04.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claim 1 is an independent claim.
3. The rejections of claims 1-20, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being over Cox has been withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 10, 14, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeung et al., USPN 6,668,246 filed (3/24/99) in view of Rhoads et al., USPN 6,636,615 filed (11/3/99).

In reference to independent claim 1, 14, Yeung teaches:

- A platform comprises an electronic device including a processor and a communication device to transmit and/or receive content. Content is generally defined as data in the form of video, images, audio, text, programs or any combination thereof. See column 2, lines 49-59. The reference provides a reasonable suggestion of multimedia content being received and sent.

- Content protection mechanisms (e.g. watermark insertion, visual/perceptual scrambling) being performed on content delivered to a client platform. A first content protection mechanism performs robust watermark insertion by embedding data into content. See column 4, lines 43-47 and column 5, lines 1-10. The reference suggests the watermarking of a portion of

Art Unit: 2178

the original multimedia content source to provide content protection; however, the reference does not explicitly teach watermarking a content source twice, each time with a different watermark. Rhoads provides an image that has two digital watermarks inserted therein. The two distinct watermarks demonstrate multimedia content version with two watermarks. The final transformation of the document disclosed in Rhoads provides a reasonable suggestion of a final watermarked content source utilizing different watermarked versions of the original document. Because the claim limitations are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation within the scope of the art, the multiple watermarking methods of Rhoads combined with the watermarking methods of Yeung provide a reasonable interpretation of the claimed subject matter when read as a whole. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yeung and Rhoads before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the watermark methods taught by Yeung to include the multiple watermark methods of Rhoads, because the methods would have given an author the added benefit of tracking multiple transformations of an original copy for enhanced copyright protection.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Yeung teaches:

A first content protection mechanism performs robust watermark insertion by embedding data into content. Data may be embedded into content in an unobtrusive way so that the quality of content is not reduced and subsequently extracted for analysis. See column 5, lines 1-10.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Yeung teaches:

To support watermarking in a spatial domain, access control logic may signal a decompression unit to decompress content before data is embedded. See column 5, lines 10-20.

In reference to dependent claim 10, Yeung teaches:

Art Unit: 2178

Prior to degrading to quality of content to produce deliverable content, a fourth content protection mechanism performs a fast watermark insertion scheme by embedding data that identifies the targeted recipient of deliverable content. See column 6, lines 52-60.

In reference to dependent claim 17-20, the claims reflect similar methods used for performing the steps of utilizing two watermarks as claimed in claims 1-3, and in further view of the following, are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 4-9, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Brogliatti et al., USPN 6,564,225 filed (7/14/2000)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 703-305-8043.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML
April 13, 2004


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER